

## REMARKS

### PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME BY ONE MONTH:

This amendment and response is submitted with a petition for extension of time by one (1) month. Approval of this petition is hereby requested.

### PROVISIONAL ELECTION RESTRICTION ACKNOWLEDGED:

In the aforementioned Office Action, the Examiner indicates that “Applicant’s election in Paper No. 4 is Acknowledged.” However, Applicants wish to clarify that because the restriction requirement was traversed and the election was provisional and because all the claims have been retained and considered by the Examiner on the merits, the provisional election is moot and of no further effect.

### THE CLAIMS:

#### Status:

Claims 1-52 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 18 and 32 have been amended to correct matters of form. Claims 49-52 have been added for the same reason. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments or new claims. Therefore, consideration and entry of the amendments and new claims are hereby respectfully requested.

#### Claim Objections:

The Examiner indicates that Claims 1, 5 and 32 are objected to. The claim amendments address these objections except as to claim 5. Applicants respectfully disagree with the objection to claim 5 and wish to draw the Examiner’s attention to claim 1 in which there is antecedent basis for the term “second point,” at the third element. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these claim rejections is hereby requested.

#### Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-48 have been rejected by the Examiner. Specifically, the Examiner rejected

claims 1-18, 22-24, 28-30 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,489,688 to Baumann (hereafter “Baumann”). However, Baumann does not support these claim rejections because it does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, nor does it enable the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

An integrated circuit comprising:

a power supply I/O pad;

an I/O pad of a first type... ; and

a strip of deposited conductor substantially adjacent to the I/O pad of the first type, ... wherein the I/O pad of the first type is narrower than the power supply I/O pad so as to allow space for the strip.

Claims 22 and 34 have analogous recitations of such elements. One benefit derived from the claimed invention as recited in these claims is the elimination of the trade off between data I/Os and Power Supply I/Os (See, e.g., Applicants’ Original Disclosure at page 10, lines 14-18). Another benefit derived from this invention is the reduction in IR (voltage) drops at the logic (See, e.g., Applicants’ Disclosure at page 11, lines 15-20).

By contrast, Baumann, does not teach or suggest this combination, nor does it produce its benefits. For example, Baumann does not disclose “a strip of deposited conductor substantially adjacent to the I/O pad of the first type, ... wherein the I/O pad of the first type is narrower than the power supply I/O pad so as to allow space for the strip.” Bauman neither shows nor discloses or suggests using an I/O pad narrower than the power supply I/O pad.

Indeed, Bauman is directed to an aspect of integrated circuit interconnect structure that is all together different from that of the claimed invention. While the claimed invention uses for (the narrower) strips of deposited conductors the space that would otherwise be allocated to the power supply I/O pads, Baumann uses alternate placement of bond pads inside and outside the I/O driver ring (core) to increase the pitch between them (See, e.g., Baumann’s abstract, Figures 2-6, Col. 1, lines 57-63, col. 3, lines 2-40, 52-65, and Col. 4, lines 5-50). In other words, Bauman addresses a different problem, produces a different structure and derives a different result from those of the claimed invention as recited in claims 1, 22 and 34.

Moreover, Applicants do not perceive Baumann’s disclosure to show or suggest that the

bond pads 62 and 66 are necessarily the power supply I/O pads. Nor do Applicants perceive Baumann's disclosure to show or suggest that the strip is necessarily the portion between pads 62 and 66. Accordingly, Applicants do not draw the same analogy to the claimed invention that the Examiner suggests as to claims 1, 22 and 34.

Then, as to claims that depend from claims 1, 22 and 34, respectively, because Baumann does not teach or suggest the strips, as recited in claims 1, 22 and 34, it also does not teach how such strips might be connected. Even if Baumann were to have identifiable points on the integrated circuit it does not teach or suggest the combination of strips, as recited in claims 1, 22 and 34, that are connected to the first, second, third and/or fourth points on the integrated circuit.

For reasons as outlines above, Baumann does not anticipate nor enable the claimed invention as recited in claims 1, 22, 34 and their respective dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Additionally, in the above mentioned Office Action the Examiner indicates that claims 19-21, 25-27, 31-33 and 37-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as "being unpatentable over... Baumann." However, Applicants would appreciate a clarification of these claim rejections that would allow Applicants to more specifically consider and address the Examiner's assertions.

Even as understood, the Examiner appears to suggest that figure 5 teaches in combination with figure 4 multiple layers as recited in the above-enumerated dependent claims. However, these figures do not appear to bear out this result. In fact they are described as "a top plan view" of the integrated circuit die (see, e.g., brief description of the drawings). With the various assertions, as now understood, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness in view of Baumann. Simply stated, whether Baumann is considered singly in some alleged combination derived from Baumann, it does not produce the claimed invention as recited in the above-enumerated dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

#### New Claims:

The new claims are derived from the original claim 18 and are different from it in form,



rather than material substance. The arguments above apply to the new claims with equal force and effect.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing Applicants believe that claims 1-52 are allowable over the cited references. The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to deposit account 50-2778.

Date: July 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted

Leah Sherry, Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 43,918

**DECHERT LLP**

**Customer No. 37509**

Telephone: 650.813.4800

Facsimile: 650.813.4848

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited (along with any paper referred to herein) with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail addressed to: Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on

Date: July 15, 2004

by

Yvette Yurraide-Owen